

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-2 and 4 are indicated as allowed.

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended independent claim 5 and replace Fig. 3 of the specification.

Accordingly, claims 1-2 and 4-7 are pending for further consideration.

**Drawings**

To overcome the Office Action's objection of the drawings, Applicants concurrently file a Submission of Formal Drawings with two (2) sheets of formal drawings to substitute the original filed drawing sheets. The new formal drawings amend Fig. 3 to include the label "Related Art." Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be removed.

**All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action takes the position that “each of the plurality of contacts including one of a male connection structure and a female connection structure, the connector including at least one separate conductor extending from the rear end of the connector,” is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully remove these features from independent claim 5 in order to expedite prosecution of this case. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-7 meet all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as amended. Thus, the rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is moot because of the amendment to claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 23, 2004

By: 

Scott J. Anchell

Reg. No. 35,035

**Customer No. 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: 202.739.3000

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

In a Submission of Replacement Drawings filed concurrently herewith, Applicants respectfully request to replace the 2 original drawing sheets with the attached 2 sheets of amended drawings. The 2 drawing sheets include Figures 1A, 1B, 2, and 3, of which Figure 3 has been replaced as described below.

It is respectfully submitted that these changes introduce no new matter as they conform to the specification and/or drawings as originally filed, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.81(d).